

Remarks begin on page 7 of this paper.

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please replace the drawings previously submitted with replacement drawings of Figures 1-4. Figure 4 has been added to address the Examiner's concerns. No new matter has been introduced, and the replacement sheets of Figures 1, 2 and 3 are as originally submitted. The Figures are attached as Appendix A.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed June 29, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 5 was rejected as being indefinite, and the drawings were objected to, regarding the feature of the second print head being at a 90 degree angle to the first print head. In response, without necessarily conceding the correctness of this rejection, new Fig. 4 is added, and the specification has been amended consistent with the feature of two print heads that print onto separate lateral faces of the piece of wood which are at 90 degrees to one another when looked at in an end view. While it is respectfully submitted that the reading of the specification as filed makes this feature clear to one skilled in the art, these amendments are made to obviate the indefiniteness rejection and the objection to the drawings. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 4 as being unpatentable over HAUCK (U.S. 6,250,747) in view of WETCHLER et al. (U.S. 6,196,663) and AMAN et al. (U.S. 5,997,669). This rejection is regretfully traversed.

The Applicant notes that both HAUCK and WETCHLER are directed to typical printing technologies for paper, for example. The invention recited in the amended independent claims, however, goes beyond a novel print cartridge or print head.

The novelty of the present invention lies in the fact that the controller is adapted to actuate the valve in order to print a longitudinally oriented code on at least one lateral surface as the elongate articles pass through the printing station. The code is printed at least twice on each elongate article and that the code is unique to each of the elongate articles.

The Examiner suggests that HAUCK is silent as to having a controller operatively associated with the ink unit and the head, but that it is extremely well-known in the art of inkjet

printers that every printer must have a controller to perform many printing control functions as taught by WETCHLER.

The Examiner also affirms that it is well-known in the art to print a redundant code as taught by AMAN et al.

However, it is respectfully submitted that a close reading of AMAN teaches, first of all, that a code - if a code it is, is printed on an end surface of a wood board and not as the article is passing through a station. Secondly, in order to support this suggestion, the Examiner directs us to Figure 6 of AMAN. A close reading of the AMAN patent regarding the specification of the second alternate embodiment reveals the following:

"Referring now to FIG. 6, there is shown a second alternate embodiment to label applicator 24. Specifically, there is shown multiple material applicator with multiple spray heads 90 which is attached to horizontal arm 27 and is capable of controlled horizontal movement along arm 27 in a similar fashion to labeler 24. Applicator 90 further comprises material reservoir 94 which contains multiple materials of various optically reflective qualities, such as paints of the colors (R)ed, (B)lue, (G)reen and (Bl)ack. Applicator 90 additionally comprises multiple electrostatically directed wedge shaped spray nozzles 92. Reservoir 94 is in fluid communication with spray nozzle 92 such that the multiple materials it contains may be forceably ejected from nozzle 92 as multiple streams such as spray 98 which then adheres to the board ends of unit 10 forming uniquely identifying patterns 99. Electrical power and control signals are provided to applicator 90 via cable 96."

In fact, there is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in AMAN that redundant codes be present. In fact, the reference number 99 refers to uniquely identifying patterns. There is no mention or suggestion that these codes are redundant and nowhere does this suggestion appear in the AMAN patent.

Claim 5 has been amended to specify what was meant by the second printing head being placed a 90 degree angle. Proper support for this appears at page 6, first paragraph where it is stated that the two print heads are useful for printing the code on a square elongated article.

Thus, the print heads are adapted to print a code on two lateral surfaces of the piece of wood since the square pieces of wood can have a tendency to rotate and therefore, if the code was printed on just one lateral surface, it may not be recognised further down the processing line. The challenge in the present invention is that the pieces of wood are travelling at very high speed in the processing plant and the code must be adapted to be printed on the piece of wood as the elongated article passes through.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the application; the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-861-1696.

Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. **87367.2300**.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings
Reg. No. 32,902

Date: December 29, 2006

Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 861-1500
Fax: (202) 861-1783

APPENDIX A

Replacement drawings for Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4 are attached.